

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 12, and 14-15 have been presented for the examination. Claims 2-3, 5-11, and 13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter recited therein. Applicants acknowledge the election of claims 1-15 in response to the restriction requirement and the non-elected claims 16-23 have been canceled. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for identifying the allowable subject matter.

### **Objection to the Specification**

The abstract and disclosure is objected to for containing certain informalities. The abstract and respective sections of the disclosure have been amended to remove the identified informalities.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 7, 10, 14, and 15 were objected for containing informalities. Claims 7 and 10 have been canceled thus their rejection has rendered moot. Claims 14 and 15 have been amended to remove the informalities.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112**

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended to remove informalities. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 USC §112, first paragraph.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102(e)**

Claims 1-6, 9, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Roberts (US Patent No. 6,577,670 131). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. See M.P.E.P §2131. Claim 1 has been amended to recite method steps that are not disclosed by Roberts. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Roberts.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 9-11 have been canceled thus the rejection of these claims has rendered moot.

Claim 4 depends from amended claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from Roberts for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 12 has been amended in the manner of claim 1 and is now patentably distinguishable from Roberts.

Claim 13 has been canceled thus its rejection has rendered moot.


*Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)*

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schilling (US Patent No. 5,185,762 cited in the IDS filed August 5, 2002, Paper No. 6).

Claims 7-8 have been canceled thus their rejection has rendered moot.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Abdul Zindani  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-5137